22.10.2026
274
*Ct.-***7**
(NMD/D.Hira)

WPA 24114 of 2026

Bangarh Scholar Teachers Training Institute
-Vs-
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Arjun Chowdhury,
Mr. Sudipta Nayan Ghosh,
Ms. Srijita Ghosh,
Ms. Riya Agarwal.
... For the petitioner

Mr. Dibendra Narayan Ray, ld. G.P.,
Mr. Mrinal Kanti Sardar,
Ms. Sulogna Chowdhury.
... for the State

Mr. Subir Sanyal, ld. Sr. adv.,
Mr. Ratul Biswas,
Mr. Kaushik Chowdhury.
.... For the WBBPE

1. Affidavit-of-service filed on behalf of the writ pei6ttoner, in Court today, is taken on record.
2. The writ petitioner, respondent State and the West Bengal Board of Primary Education are represented by their respective learned counsel.
3. At the time of hearing, Mr. Chowdhury, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the writ petitioner submits before this Court that the writ petitioner is aggrieved for non-consideration of his representation dated 16.03.2026 as has been annexed at page 26 of the instant writ petition, by the respondent no. 2 authority.

4. Mr. Kaushik Chowdhury, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the respondent no. 2/Board submits before this Court that the subject matter of the said representation dated 16.03.2026 is the policy decision of the State and therefore, the respondent Board is not the competent authority to take a conscious decision of the matter.
5. Learned advocate for the respondent State submits before this Court that the instant writ petition is devoid of merit.
6. On careful perusal of the entire materials as placed before this Court, it appears that the writ petitioner submitted its representation dated 16.03.2026 with the respondent no. 2 authority with a request to change the medium of imparting education from Bengali to Hindi in respect of 50 seats out of 100 seats.
7. No cogent reason has been shown by the respondent no. 2/Board as to what prompted them to go for eternal slumber over such representation.
8. In view of such, this Court while disposing the instant writ petition directs the respondent no. 2 authority to consider the representation dated 16.03.2026 in accordance with law and after giving an opportunity of hearing to the writ petitioner and/or his authorized representative,

shall pass a reasoned order and shall forthwith communicate the same to the writ petitioner, preferably by e-mail, if the e-mail details of the writ petitioner is provided to him at the time of hearing.

9. The entire exercise, as indicated in the foregoing paragraph, is to be completed by the respondent no. 2 authority positively within 45 working days from the date of communication of the server copy of this order.

10. The time limit as fixed by this Court is peremptory and mandatory.

11. Liberty is given to the learned advocate on record of the writ petitioner to communicate the server copy of this order to the respondent no. 2 authority, who is directed to act on the server copy of this order.

12. With the aforementioned observation, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**.

13. Before parting with, it is, however made clear that while disposing of the instant writ petition this Court has not gone into the merits of the representation dated 16.03.2026, as submitted by the writ petitioner and thus, all points are kept open for adjudication by the respondent no. 2 authority.

(Partha Sarathi Sen, J.)